

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

DIMONIQUE GIBBS, INDIVIDUALLY;
A.L.G., A MINOR (AUGUST 30, 2013), BY
AND THROUGH HIS NATURAL PARENT
DIMONIQUE GIBBS; A.G., A MINOR (JULY
15, 2016), BY AND THROUGH HER
NATURAL PARENT DIMONIQUE GIBBS;
J.E., A MINOR, (APRIL 22, 2008), BY AND
THROUGH HER NATURAL PARENT
DIMONIQUE GIBBS;

Plaintiffs,

VS.

BONNIE LYN GUTWEILER,
INDIVIDUALLY, HEDING TRUCK SERVICE,
INC., A DOMESTIC BUSINESS, DOES I
THROUGH X, AND ROE CORPORATIONS I
THROUGH X, INCLUSIVE,

Defendants.

CASE NO.: 2:23-cv-01896-JCM-MDC

**ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

The Court has reviewed plaintiffs' *Motion for Protective Order* at ECF No. 30 ("Motion"). The Court denies the Motion without prejudice. The Court is concerned about the parties' failure to meaningfully meet and confer. Both parties have an obligation to meaningfully, substantively, and in good faith, meet and confer to discuss each discovery request. *Las Vegas Skydiving Adventures LLC v. Groupon, Inc.*, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 191754, *4 (D. Nev. Oct. 16, 2020). Both parties here failed their meet and confer obligations. To be sure, it is unreasonable that the parties were not able agree on a single matter and narrow their dispute in any manner.

The Court orders both parties to meet and confer. To do so meaningfully, sincerely, and in good faith. And to discuss the categories of documents requested by the subpoenas and actually attempt, in good faith, to resolve their disputes. The Court notes that there are several categories of documents that are discoverable and some that may not be discoverable. The parties are to bring back to the Court only those

1 specific documents which the parties are unable to agree upon. Any future briefs must include declarations
2 by **both** counsel detailing the meet and confer efforts. Finally, the plaintiffs filed copies of the subpoenas
3 (ECF No. 30-1) in support of their Motion but, in apparent haste, did not redact the social security number
4 and date of birth of plaintiff Dominique Gibbs in violation of LR IC 6-1(1) and (3). To protect the plaintiff,
5 the Court has sealed ECF No. 30-1.

6
7 For the foregoing reasons,

8 IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's Motion (ECF No. 30) is DENIED without prejudice.

9
10 Dated: June 26, 2024.

11
12 
13 Maximiliano D. Couvillier III
14 United States Magistrate Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25